

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending. Claims 1-44 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 12-14, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24-30, 32, 33, 36, 40, and 42 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,026,362, issued to Kim et al. (referred to herein as “*Kim*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Although Claims 1-44 are rejected over *Kim*, in view of the amendments to the Claims, Applicants address the rejection over *Kim* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,782,386 issued to Gebauer (referred to herein as “*Gebauer*”).

Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention generates and **utilizes web pages having specific data and/or options for debugging an application program** on a server using a debugger program on the server in a method and system not taught or suggested by *Kim* in view of *Gebauer*.

Gebauer relates to “utilizing an internet terminal coupled to the world wide web to access an existing proprietary data base management system having a dialog-based request format.” *Gebauer*, Abstract. The results and intermediate results of an execution of sequenced data base management commands in a trace mode by a debug program located on the server are stored in a debug file for future access by a service developer at a user terminal. *Gebauer*, Abstract.

Referring to *Kim* Figure 1, *Kim* teaches that “respective portions 115 and 111 of the debugger software are preferably designed to operate simultaneously on the client 112 and server 102 computers.” *Kim*, col. 7, lines 25-28. “Coordination between the operations performed by the two portions of the debugger software are maintained by communication over a network 128.” *Id.*, lines 28-31. *Kim* further teaches that the “debugger operates according to the process steps illustrated in FIGS. 7(a) and 7(b).” *Id.*, col. 10, lines 33-34. “The debugger [] reads the

symbolic information 704 from the server computer's memory 110 or associated disk subsystem 106, derives the call graph relationships among the various functions 706 and reads the frame information and pointer information from the server memory 708.” *Id.*, col. 10, lines 40-44. The server then transmits this information over the network 128 to the debug client 710. *Kim* fails to teach or suggest any web page based debugging. *Kim* does not teach that the debugger software on client 112 is web based.

Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Kim* in view of *Gebauer* do not teach or suggest “receiving a first web page from the server for displaying a user frame in the web browser at the workstation and displaying the user frame of the first web page in the web browser at the workstation, wherein the user frame includes information generated by the application program.” Claim 1. (emphasis added). Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that *Kim* in view of *Gebauer* fail to teach or suggest “displaying a debug view option in the web browser at the workstation for generating a second web page having a debug frame of the application program.” *Id.* Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Kim* in view of *Gebauer* fail to teach or suggest “receiving the second web page from the server for displaying the debug frame in the web browser at the workstation when the debug view option is selected and displaying the debug frame of the second web page in the web browser at the workstation, wherein the debug frame includes information about one or more components of the application program.” *Id.*

Claim 9.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Kim* in view of *Gebauer* do not teach or suggest “generating information for a first web page, wherein the first web page comprises a user frame that includes information generated by the application program.” Claim 9. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that *Kim* in view of *Gebauer* fail to teach or suggest “generating information for a second web page, wherein the second web page comprises a debug frame when a debug view option is selected from the workstation, **wherein the debug frame includes information about components of the application program.**” *Id.*

Claim 17.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Kim* in view of *Gebauer* do not teach or suggest “means for receiving a first web page from the server for displaying a user frame in the web browser at the workstation and means for displaying the user frame of the first web page in the web browser at the workstation, **wherein the user frame includes information generated by the application program.**” Claim 17. (emphasis added). Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that *Kim* in view of *Gebauer* fail to teach or suggest “means for presenting a debug view option in the web browser at the workstation to generate a second web page having a debug frame of the application program.” *Id.* Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Kim* in view of *Gebauer* fail to teach or suggest “means for receiving the second web page from the server for displaying the debug frame in the web browser at the workstation when the debug view option is selected and means for presenting the debug frame of the second web page in the web browser at the workstation, **wherein the debug frame includes information about one or more components of the application program.**” *Id.*

Claim 21.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Kim* in view of *Gebauer* do not teach or suggest “means for generating information for a first web page, wherein the first web page comprises a user frame that includes information generated by the application program.” Claim 21. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that *Kim* in view of *Gebauer* fail to teach or suggest “means for generating information for a second web page, wherein the second web page comprises a debug frame when a debug view option is selected from the workstation, **wherein the debug frame includes information about components of the application program.**” *Id.*

Claim 29.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Kim* in view of *Gebauer* do not teach or suggest:

“a web browser executable at the workstation operable to:

interact with a web page displayed by the web browser to allow a user to **invoke the application program and the debugger program** from the

workstation to cause the server to execute the application program and the debugger program;

present a first web page in the web browser, wherein the first web page comprises a user frame that includes information generated by the application program;

present a debug view option to generate a second web page having a debug frame of the application program; and

present the debug frame of the second web page when the debug view option is selected, wherein the debug frame includes information about one or more components of the application program. Claim 29.

Claim 36.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Kim* in view of *Gebauer* do not teach or suggest “**means for executing the application program and the debugger program on the server** when the application program is invoked from the workstation.” Claim 36. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that *Kim* in view of *Gebauer* fail to teach or suggest “means for generating information for a first web page, wherein the first web page comprises a user frame that includes information generated by the application program.” *Id.* Applicants also respectfully submit that *Kim* in view of *Gebauer* fail to teach or suggest “a debugger program operable to generate information for a second web page, wherein the second web page comprises a debug frame when a debug view option is selected from the workstation, **wherein the debug frame includes information about components of the application program.**” *Id.*

Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 21, 29, and 36 are allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Applicants respectfully submit that claims directly or indirectly dependent upon Claims 1, 9, 17, 21, 29, and 36 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim upon which each dependent claim depends.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 32, 33, 42, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kim* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,782,386 issued to *Gebauer* (referred to herein as “*Gebauer*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 29 and 36 are allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 32 and 33 are allowable for at least the same reason as Claim 29. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 42 and 43 are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 36.

In view of the amendments herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at (512) 338-9100.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED ON JUNE 27, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kent B. Chambers

Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839